



The People's Convention says . . .

WHAT ARE WE WAITING FOR?

WHAT are we waiting for? Why can we not attack Hitler in the west—now, when almost the whole of his forces are on the eastern front? Now, when it is officially admitted that he has been forced to garrison France with elderly men and boy soldiers? Now, when all over Europe millions of our friends are already risking their lives in action against the Nazis?

These are questions that are in the minds of millions of British men and women. Newspapers of the most varied political brands are asking them.

From the great war factories telegrams and deputations are being sent to Downing Street to demand an answer to those questions—to demand action.

Says Cassandra in the Daily Mirror:—"Russia calls upon us to strike in the west. The call is NOT for mere supplies—the demand is for MILITARY action." Says A. J. Cummings in the News Chronicle:—"The people "is in an angry mood over our prolonged passivity." And other newspapers echo the same demand for military offensive action in the west.

There may be people in the Government, or in places of influence, who actually do not want to throw the weight of Britain into the common struggle. There may be those who share the views expressed in the notorious speech of Colonel Moore-Brabazon, Minister of Aircraft Production. There may be others who simply lack the vigour and initiative to seize this opportunity. And there may be others again who are afraid of taking risks, and believe, or pretend to believe that the British people is afraid of risks being taken.

It is absolutely essential that the people, all of us, should bring home to the Government with all possible force, that we are prepared to rally in support of a policy of offensive action in the west, however audacious designed to force a second front upon Hitler.

The Government must be told that that is the policy the people want, and that it will fully support the Government in carrying it out.

The People's Convention urges you to play your part in making this demand known to the Government. Your voice can help to "get action" at this moment of supreme crisis and supreme opportunity. See that whatever organisation you belong to joins in the demand. Support the meetings and demonstrations, big and small, which are being held all over the country to express the will of the people on this tremendous issue.



Manifesto issued by the National People's Convention

October, 1941

THE common struggle of Britain and the Soviet Union against Hitlerite Germany has roused new hope and new determination among the peoples everywhere. In France, in Czechoslovakia, in Norway and throughout the Balkans, the men and women of the oppressed nations are redoubling their resistance to Hitler under the inspiration of the Anglo-Soviet Alliance and the magnificent Soviet resistance.

For a third of a year the Red Army has been fighting the most powerful war machine in the world. It has put 30 per cent. of Hitler's army out of action. The Nazi beasts who are our common enemy have never in their lives been hit so hard.

Fighting for themselves and for us, the Soviet people have endured huge losses and indescribable sacrifices. From Murmansk to the Black Sea the earth is covered with the bodies of men who died in our common cause, and with the ruins of farms and cities destroyed to prevent them from being used by the enemy. Tanks, planes and guns have been lost. Industrial production has been seriously affected.

IT is a third of a year since our Government pledged full support to the Soviet Union. The great Three Power Conference in Moscow has now laid the basis for a more comprehensive and systematic supply of arms and material from Britain and the United States. Previously, considerable quantities of material had been sent to the Soviet Union, and a Wing of the R.A.F. is already in action there.

It is vital that the full decisions of the Moscow Conference should be carried into reality without delay or hindrance.

For up till now an impression of tardiness and half-heartedness has been created. Moore-Brabazon, Minister for Aircraft Production, has voiced sentiments which have caused the gravest uneasiness. There is anxiety about the Government's attitude to the creation of a second front, its unwillingness to take early offensive action in the West, and the ambiguity of its attitude in the Far East.

The people want the Government to act with greater decision. They want it to be a real win-the-war Government. They want to strengthen it and to remove from all positions of authority and influence all those who lack either the ability or the necessary conviction to carry out their task. All this is necessary to command the confidence of the people.

The people are ready to give every support, make every sacrifice to rally round the Government in the carrying out of such measures.

The People's Convention demands that every ounce of British resource and effort should be mobilised NOW and thrown NOW into the common fight. Supplies must reach the eastern front without delay and on a huge scale. Offensive action elsewhere must be undertaken to relieve the enormous pressure which our Allies, virtually alone, are so gallantly sustaining.

EVERY hindrance to war production must be swept away. When the British workers understood the tanks they were making were to go directly into battle against Hitler, they raised production by 20 per cent. The same spirit can get similar results throughout our war factories. If the increased effort of the workers alone can raise production by 20 per cent., it is clear that much greater results still could be gained if hindrances to production on the managerial and Government side were properly tackled, with advantage both to ourselves and our allies.

The People's Convention calls upon the workers to show the way by their initiative and example to greater production. It calls for the fullest support for the demands of the Shop Stewards who are leading the fight to organise the factories for victory.

The struggle to build up the physique and morale of the people and to defend them against profiteers is more urgent than ever.

The People's Convention demands fairer and more rigorous control of the nation's food supplies. It demands that available supplies should be distributed strictly in accordance with the needs of those who are bearing the brunt of the war effort. It demands the suppression of the black market, and more drastic penalties for speculators and profiteers.

The standard of protection against bombing must at once be raised, and full provision made for the homeless. All inefficiencies in the general work of A.R.P. must be eliminated.

The pay of the armed forces and the allowances for their dependants must be increased.

TO defend themselves against Fascism, the people must be in possession of their full democratic rights. Without them the workers in industry cannot play their full part in production for victory. With full democratic rights and a free Press, the people can expose and defeat profiteers, incompetents and Quislings and can play a more conscious part in the struggle.

The peoples of India and of the colonies are deeply opposed to Fascism and have a great record in the anti-Fascist struggle. At the moment they are prevented from throwing their full support into the fight.

Their just demands must be met, and in particular all the political prisoners in India must be released.

Thus organised for the struggle, with every man and woman playing their part in the common effort, with bold and determined leadership on the part of the Government, with complete collaboration between Britain and the Soviet Union, this mighty alliance of the peoples against Fascism can go forward to the destruction of Hitlerism and to victory.

Commander Edgar Young says the Government must

TIGHTEN UP THE BLOCKADE

"GERMANY has direct responsibility for feeding the people in the conquered countries." As one reads this quotation from a letter written by Mr. Cordell Hull, one breathes a sigh of relief that common-sense has not been banished entirely from the conduct of world affairs.

The letter was in reply to a request for the U.S. State Department's views on proposed legislation which would call upon it to work out, in co-operation with the British authorities, a scheme whereby food should be supplied by the U.S.A. to "the small democracies of Europe," such as, for instance, Greece, now under the heel of Axis domination.

It was a suitable reply to such an amazing proposal, and in striking contrast to that which our own Government has given to the proposal in question that some 50,000 tons of foodstuffs and medical supplies should be bought from Turkey by the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation (an organ of the British Government) and dispatched to Greece, payment being made by the American Vanderbilt Committee for the Assistance of Greece.

It is not surprising that the German and Italian Governments, which are hard put to find means whereby they may loot the countries which their armies overrun without producing famine (and consequent disorders), should have given formal assurances that these timely supplies shall not be diverted to other purposes, and should have guaranteed safe passage to the ships which carry them and have even consented to those ships carrying also parcels for British prisoners of war in Greece.

WHAT is surprising is that our Government should have consented in principle, and with apparent pleasure, to a proposal whereby the pressure of our blockade upon the enemy countries

would be relieved, just when, thanks to the participation of the Soviet Union on our side, that pressure seems likely, at last, to become effective.

Acquiescence to a proposal which would alleviate the situation of our opponents can hardly be regarded as being, in the long run, in the interest of their victims, whose condition it is supposedly to improve. For the interest of those victims is surely that their oppressors should be vanquished as speedily as possible, rather than that they themselves should be rendered by us more capable of performing the onerous and distasteful tasks which are being thrust upon them—such as, for instance, the construction of the aerodromes, for lack of which we were unable to save them from their present fate, in order that they may be used for our further embarrassment in Egypt and elsewhere. It is even more obvious, of course, that such action is contrary to the interest, both immediate and long-term, of our own country and of its active Allies.

IT has needed, however, an American to call us to our senses, in words which may well be echoed by those responsible for our amazing blunder. "This Government," wrote Mr. Cordell Hull, "is deeply sympathetic with the needs for relief of every part of the world. But it is clear that the responsibility and manifest duty to supply this relief rests with the occupying authorities. It is well known that the Germans have removed from these countries vast quantities of foodstuffs belonging to the peoples of those countries, and diverted food supplies to those countries from children to people working on behalf of Germany's military effort. It is extremely difficult, therefore, to understand why the sponsors of the legislation have made no effort to have Germany carry out the duty which it assumed when it took over the countries by force. It is all the more difficult to understand why no demand has been made on Germany to fulfil these obligations."

(Continued on Page 9)

PRODUCTION INCREASES

"TANKS FOR RUSSIA" WEEK broke all previous production records by 20 per cent., it is officially stated. And the week before, 20 per cent. lower, had itself been regarded, rightly, as a remarkable effort on the part of the workers. And tanks week was only a beginning.

What did that prove? First of all, it proved that when the working people of Britain really know and understand that their work is essential work for the great common front of the peoples against Hitlerism, when they know and understand that by their work they are bringing immediate help to the heroic Red Army, then production goes up with a bang.

That is a proof of what has been said at many production conferences in the last few weeks. A proof that there must be a huge extension of the political understanding of what this desperately crucial struggle means, what the fight of the Red Armies means for us, what the common front means.

THE COMMON FRONT AND ABOVE all the vital second front in the west, cannot be maintained except on the basis of maximum production. We should be kidding ourselves if we supposed that in every factory and workshop, every worker already understands and acts upon this fact. Everyone, in the factories and on construction jobs and in other parts of the war machine, can tell stories of a failure by some of the workers to understand these facts as yet.

The People's Convention is pledged to do all in its power to make these facts known, and to rally opinion in such a fashion that every man and woman in the factories gives his or her best to the war effort.

To see that as was said of Cromwell's armies "they know what they are fighting for and love what they know."

Nobody supposes that production records of this kind can be achieved, let alone maintained, without grave sacrifices. Everyone knows that hard won and hardly defended Trades Union practices, all sorts of traditions, have to be modified, all sorts of otherwise "impossible" concessions made in the interests of the common struggle.

The lead given by Shop Stewards at the production conferences that have been held up and down the country, proves that everywhere the workers are showing themselves ready to make such sacrifices and concessions—on top of the

And More

other sacrifices they have already made in the interests of the war effort.

That is one side of the picture—a nobody denies that there is a long way to go yet before the whole country understands and acts upon the necessities, the moment in the same spirit, and with the same results as were achieved Tanks for Russia Week.

THE PEOPLE'S CONVENTION was the first body in this country to start to get things moving on the production front. The People's Convention began by organising a meeting at which Shop Stewards were able frankly to discuss with M.P.'s some of the problems of production, and such was the interest aroused, that this meeting was followed by another and much larger one at the House of Commons.

Now, the Shop Stewards themselves have been holding a series of big production conferences, and these are leading up to a great National Production Conference in London on October 19.

In order to accommodate the huge number of delegates expected from over the country it has been necessary to take the Stoll Theatre for it.

A writer in the New Statesman recently declared that it is no exaggeration to describe this Conference as being at least as important for the course of the war as an important meeting of the War Cabinet.

If Tanks for Russia Week proves what the workers can do in so great a cause, it proves something else too:—for the 20 per cent. was achieved by the efforts of the workers alone, in the sense that it was achieved without there having been put into practice any of the big improvements in the whole industrial machinery which experts ranging from the Shop Stewards to the Select Committee on National Expenditure and many others have been demanding.

Just imagine what a jump there could be in production if, in addition to the workers putting on this terrific new drive, there were a real tackling of the things that are holding up production on the managerial side, the Government side, the side of Big Business.

The first essential is, of course, that the representatives of the workers on the j

BY WORKERS' EFFORTS

is Needed

have got to be consulted a great deal more about the problems of production and how to tackle them.

IT'S PERFECTLY OBVIOUS THAT IN a large number of cases, production is held up by conditions of mismanagement or inefficiency which are "special" to that factory. These are day to day problems, arising on the spot: and they can only be tackled on the spot, by consultation on the spot.

As Jack Owen says in his pamphlet "Factory Front," the industrial workers must "Give and Take a Hand" in production.

There is plenty of evidence that in many cases managements, even though they are incapable of running things efficiently and getting full production by their present methods, are fiercely resisting all attempts to tackle their problems by giving the workers on the job an increased say in the running of things. There have been cases in which large numbers of the most active and militant Shop Stewards, who have taken the lead in trying to solve local production problems, have been threatened with dismissal or transfer by frightened and reactionary managements.

And it can be noted as a sign of the way some of these people go on, that employers in the Engineering Industry have actually issued a circular suggesting that no help should be given from the employers' side to the Amalgamated Engineering Union's attempt to organise a nation wide enquiry into production problems in the engineering trades, and how they can best be solved.

In addition to these local special prob-

lems of particular factories and jobs, there is a long, long list of much more general—one might almost say universal—factors that are holding up production and making against efficiency.

HIGH ON THE LIST OF THESE comes the contracting system known as Cost Plus Ten Per Cent. Even The Times has described this as an "economic iniquity." Put in a nutshell, it means that the more the job costs, the higher will be the absolute total of the profits accruing to the contractor. And



TANKS! MORE TANKS!! AND STILL MORE TANKS!!!

Tanks rolled off the production lines faster than ever before when the call came to send them into battle against the Nazis.

out of that, in turn, arise a great many of the notorious evils of the sub-contracting system. For what is easier than for a big contractor to set up all around him a whole cloud of what are really dummy companies—or to buy financial control of a lot of small companies already in existence—and then to sub-contract the job to them, so that in fact he gets the money "going and coming."

He gets a profit out of high prices charged by the nominally independent sub-contractor, and then those high prices go into his own costs, with the re-

sult that his final 10 per cent. on his total costs is higher than if the costs had been kept low.

It would be hard to sit down and work out a system more absolutely certain to result in a vast looting of the public money and, what is of at least equal importance, a vast inefficiency in production—since a premium is put on the most complex and costly system of sub-contracting, instead of on the one which it is judged most likely to get results quickly and cheaply.

No wonder that The Banker, one of the most important financial reviews, remarked as long as one year ago that "it is something of a miracle that production ever takes place at all."

THE PEOPLE'S CONVENTION stands with those who demand a swift and drastic overhaul of this grotesque system. It is a big job, but it is by no means an impossible one.

It is not as though cost plus 10 per cent were at this moment by any means the only system of contracting used in this country. There are two other systems in use—one just as bad if not worse than cost plus 10 per cent., and the other a much better one, or at least one having much better possibilities.

The bad alternative to cost plus 10 per cent. is the so-called "target" system. The essence of this is that the contract is put out with a "target" price—a maximum price, with the condition that the lower the contractor keeps his real costs below that target price, the greater will be his profits. The evil and danger of this system jumps to the eye. For it is obviously in the interests of the contractor to present estimates which show the "probable" price for the job as high as it is possible to show them. (And it is in the interest of all the ring of contractors to do that.) Then, if they can get the target price fixed high enough, they stand to make big profits by getting the real cost even a little way below that figure.

The alternative is the fixed price contract, which is also in use in Britain.

It is true that this system is open to all sorts of possible abuses and mistakes, and there would always be a tussle between the Government and the contractor as to the proper price for the job. But right here, again, is where increased attention to the expert views of the men on the job can be of vital importance and can make this system workable.

THE FOOD FRONT

MUCH too slowly, and not too surely, some steps have been and are being taken by the Government to tackle the problem of food distribution in a more vigorous and practical manner.

The increase in the number of British Restaurants and similar feeding centres is a case in point. But there ought to be many, many more of them. Those that have been opened have, on the whole, proved highly successful. So why can there not be a hugely greater number of them? Of course there can. And the people must be vigilant to see that private catering interests do not stand in the way.

* * *

ANOTHER case in point is the Government's announced decision to take steps to protect the public against fake food substitutes. That is an excellent decision. It would be a good thing if it had been taken before large numbers of people were swindled by these wretched fakes. Still, it's no use crying over spilt milk-substitutes. The thing to do is to insist that the new regulations shall be framed and put into operation quickly. And that they shall be framed in such a way that the manufacturers are forced to tell the ordinary man and woman what he or she is buying in simple language which anyone can understand. We do not want to leave a loophole by which manufacturers can get away with covering their tins with a lot of scientific formulas that most people cannot make head or tail of.

* * *

IT seems incredible that at this stage of the war it should still be possible for all those who can afford the time and the money to get rationed food without toupous in public restaurants and hotels. It is a glaring demonstration of the fact that the Government is failing to understand that what the mass of the working public want is not "as little control as possible" but the maximum control—real control to ensure that ALL the available food supplies are properly directed to those who need them most. The Government gives the impression that it is fiddling about with this question. A good deal has been done, for instance, to get some extra rations of some foods for men on particularly heavy work. The principle has been recognised. But in practice it has not yet been carried anything like far enough.

“Waste Not . . .”

WE denounce waste and inefficiency. Everyone does. Everyone in the factories, and in the Army—perhaps above all in the Army—can name scores of instances of waste resulting from inefficient management and organisation.

We need to keep a vigilant watch on such things. And at the same time we want to make sure that while we are trying to put a stop to the wastefulness of the “other fellow” we are not overlooking instances of waste that we are guilty of ourselves.

Particularly in the Army there is an enormous amount of waste which could be put a stop to almost immediately—and not only by some change in policy “up top,” but by the action of the soldiers themselves.

There are cases where really valuable war material is actually being rendered useless simply because it is not being stored properly at the depots.

Partly this is of course the fault of those “on high” who do not organise the matter properly. But very often these faults can be at least partly remedied by a bit more thought and care on the part of the men who actually have to handle the stuff. And the same thing is true in the factories.

If we all of us really felt all the time, that every bit of wastage that can be cut out by our personal thought and effort is a strengthening of our resources for the common front in the fight to defeat Hitler, the result would be equivalent to a really big rise in production.

TIGHTEN UP THE BLOCKADE *(Contd. from Page 5)*

tions, when Germany has never put forward any claim to poverty of food for its own people and for its huge armies which are striking at the roots of freedom and civilisation wherever they can.”

It would seem, however, that we should do more than just echo our American mentor, when he added, in conclusion, “No further comment seems appropriate.” We have surely a right, nay, a duty, to call to account our countrymen in positions of responsibility for their folly, from which we may be saved only by the intervention of Mr. Cordell Hull.

IT is our duty to demand whether our

First Lord of the Admiralty and our Minister of Economic Warfare were consulted in this matter of helping the enemy by “breaking our own blockade,” and if so on what grounds they gave, presumably, their consent to a proposal which will not bear scrutiny in the light of mere common-sense. It is our right to demand that they, or whoever is respon-

sible, should not be allowed to take shelter under the still ample robe of our Prime Minister's personal popularity.

We have also another right, it would seem, and that is to return in kind the service which Mr. Hull has rendered us. We may surely ask him whether he considers it not unreasonable to suggest that the argument which he has so sensibly used in connection with the proposed supply of food to Greece and other countries should not, in logic, be applied also to the supply of food and oil to such countries as Spain, Unoccupied France and French North Africa. The supply of these commodities by America was arranged, with the somewhat dubious consent of our own Government authorities, in circumstances very different from those which obtain today. It was arranged before Soviet participation on our side clipped the wings of Axis aggression, and might very well be ceased now with impunity and no small advantage to our common cause.

The People's Convention say

THE TREASURY IS "MISSING THE BUS"

WHO decides how much—or how little—the soldiers' dependants are to get? Answer: The Treasury. Who is the big man at the Treasury? Answer: Sir Horace Wilson. Who is Sir Horace Wilson? Answer: The man who helped Chamberlain help Hitler at Munich, the man in charge of financial policy throughout the whole of the "phoney" war, when Hitler was supposedly "missing the bus."

They say that what goes up must come down—but Sir Horace Wilson was pushed high up by Mr. Neville Chamberlain, and since then nobody and nothing, not even his own record of monstrous blunders, seem to be able to bring him down again.

Sir Horace Wilson was at one time Industrial Adviser to the Government. When you consider the industrial policy of the Chamberlain Government you get some idea of what sort of "advice" he used to give to them. Mr. Chamberlain and the "Birmingham gang" of Big Business men—who had made a pretty good thing out of the last war—liked Sir Horace's views on money, industry and general policy so much, that they gave him a new post:—they made him principal adviser not only on industrial policy but on the whole policy of the country. Particularly the foreign policy.

"MAN BEHIND THE SCENES"

Throughout the whole period of appeasement—appeasement of Mussolini, appeasement of Hitler—Sir Horace Wilson was the "man behind-the-scenes." He sat in Downing Street at the Prime Minister's elbow, and it was generally admitted that he was the most powerful man in the country. He helped to make the Pact with Mussolini by which both Britain and Spain were betrayed to the aggressors.

By the time the British Army in France faced the Germans, the Government of which Sir Horace was adviser had had about two thousand million pounds of public money to spend on arms. And the B.E.F. was nevertheless miserably equipped.

After the disasters of Norway and France you would have thought that the new Government which then came into power would have thrown Sir Horace Wilson out of the window with other rubbish. Not at all. Sir Horace Wilson became head of the whole



British Civil Service, and—in particular—head of the Treasury: the most powerful single official in Britain.

Every soldier knows how long and hard was the first struggle to get the first small raise in pay and allowances. And even that did not keep pace with the rising cost of living. The next push for increased dependants' allowances is proving harder still.

When soldiers and M.P.'s and millions of soldiers' dependants point to the urgent necessity of increased allowances, from the standpoint of national health and hence of national productive efficiency, the Treasury has one stock reply:—"We are afraid of

inflation. You cannot get any more money because if you get it that will start a new upward curve in the 'vicious spiral' leading to inflation." It is the same reply they make to demands for increased wages.

Listen to what the Financial News has to say on this subject.

"The Treasury is terrified of paying out money for purposes which would help the war effort." Can you imagine a graver accusation than that? And it comes not from any "radical" source, but from the organ of the City financial experts—a paper owned and run until very recently by the present Minister of Information, Mr. Brendan Bracken.

"For fear of accentuating inflation" the Financial News goes on "the Treasury clamps down on money payments of all kinds. It is this which explains inadequate pay for soldiers, inadequate allowances to their dependants, the skimping of legitimate compensation payments—all of which breed more damage to morale than the additional inflation which might (only might!) result from fair treatment."

"INFLATION PHOBIA"

It is because of this "inflation phobia" at the Treasury, adds the Financial News, that we are "afraid to offer attractive wages in war employments," so that men transferred from unessential to essential industries are sometimes penalised by a heavy loss in wages.

Just to take one example of the way these people's minds work:—Everyone knows that because of the low scale of pay to junior officers, there has been a definite bar to the taking of commissions by N.C.O.'s who—except financially—are fully qualified to take them. That means that at least one road towards the "democratisation of the Army" to which everyone pays lip service is closed; by the Treasury. So what did they do to remedy this state of affairs? Well, the other day a titled lady wrote to The Times newspaper an appeal to all those in the stately homes of England who happen to have old and valuable lace lying about—family heirlooms, Greatgrandmamma's wedding veil, and so on.

She asked that owners of such lace should be kind enough to take it out of the lavender and send it in to a central depot in London.

At this depot the lace would be made up into various forms of "chic" ornamental clothing for women. These made up goods—some of them with tags attached telling the family his-

tory of the lace they were made out of—would then be shipped through the battle of the Atlantic to New York, where they would be put on sale on Fifth Avenue, to be purchased by the upper crust of fashionable New York society.

That would bring in dollars. Then the dollars could be converted into pounds, and then the pounds could be used to distribute charity payments to the dependants of our junior officers.

If that isn't a nice, neat practical scheme for getting on with the job of arranging to keep soldiers' dependants out of the workhouse and throw the door wide to N.C.O.'s who want to get into the Commissioned ranks.

Even The Times admits that there is "public anxiety" regarding the scale of dependants' allowances.

Commenting on the results at Scarborough, where the independent scored 8,000 votes against 12,500 for the Government candidate, The Times notes that "there is another reason" (apart from the general desire to "ginger up" the Government) "why the defeated candidate at Scarborough did so well. He made a specific point of his anxiety to deal with alleged grievances among members of the Services; and something of the same sort appears in the rather vague election literature of the second of the two independent candidates at the Wrekin."

ALLOWANCES OF MARRIED OFFICERS

"Only recently, new regulations affecting the allowances of married officers have been issued. They have had a rather mixed reception, because though they give increases to junior officers under thirty years of age with the largest family responsibilities, in the case of officers over thirty they involve reductions in the case of childless couples and of more senior officers with small families. . . .

"The allowances payable in respect of other ranks are due for discussion, and the Scarborough election in particular shows clearly the public anxiety that legitimate claims should be met."

NOTE: At the moment of going to press the Government have announced some further concessions to dependants. While the method proposed is open to sharp criticism, the Government's action shows that the Treasury cannot always have its own way and indicates that considerable headway has already been made by the agitation.

“People’s Investment”

THE other articles in the “Special” will have told you what the Convention stands for. . . . I am going to tell you that how we stand (or fall) depends upon the support you give us.

You may think that “People’s Investment” is rather far removed from the People’s Convention, but by supporting the Convention you are, in a way, making an investment. Of course we don’t pay dividends, issue Preferential shares or water down capital, etc., etc., but by supporting us we give another kind of return—you will be helping the achievement of the free peoples of the world in their fight against fascism.

We need money for our work and we need it badly—we need funds to organise meetings, to put before the people of this country the vital issues now facing them, to show them what they can do to pull their weight in the titanic struggle taking place.

No one can remain outside today, each and every one is affected and we need your help to mobilise the people of Britain so that everything possible is done in solidarity with the Soviet Union; so that we bring as much pressure as possible on the Government to effect the points of our Manifesto. We must galvanise the people of Britain so that everyone does something, like this man of 70 and boy of 11.

“ . . . enclosed is six 1d stamps. I am 70 and have little to spare out of my Old Age Pension, but I could go from door to door selling ‘Together Against Hitler’ and ‘British Soviet Unity.’ . . . ”

and

“ My brother Tom, who is now in the Army, asked me to send you this donation, and I have added 6d of my own as you are doing some jolly good work.”

The above are only two examples—friends, we hope you will provide hundreds more.

Nothing is too small and, of course, need I say, nothing is too big!

PHYLLIS ROSE.

To:

.....1941

National Committee,
People’s Convention,
24, High Holborn,
London, W.C.1.

I am enclosing £ : : as a donation towards
the Convention Fund.

NAME

(PLEASE WRITE IN BLOCK LETTERS)

ADDRESS